

Casimir effect and vacuum energy

Cyriaque Genet¹, Astrid Lambrecht¹ and Serge Reynaud¹

¹*Laboratoire Kastler Brossel UPMC/ENS/CNRS case 74, Campus Jussieu, F75252 Paris Cedex 05*

Abstract. Vacuum fluctuations have observable consequences, like the Casimir force appearing between two mirrors in vacuum. This force is now measured with good accuracy and agreement with theory. We discuss the meaning and consequences of these statements by emphasizing their relation with the problem of vacuum energy, one of the main unsolved problems at the interface between gravitational and quantum theory.

The emergence of quantum theory has profoundly altered our conception of empty space by forcing us to consider vacuum as permanently filled by quantum field fluctuations. These fluctuations have numerous observable effects in microscopic physics. They also have manifestations in the macroscopic world, such as the Casimir force appearing between two mirrors in vacuum as a consequence of the radiation pressure of vacuum fluctuations. This force has recently been measured with a good accuracy and in a correct agreement with theory, the latter taking into account the real optical properties of the mirrors used in the experiments.

Before discussing the precise meaning of these statements, we will present historical remarks devoted to the birth of the theory of vacuum fluctuations as well as the difficult relation of their energy with gravitation theory. We will also emphasize some features of the Casimir effect which may be of interest in the cosmological context discussed in the present volume [1]. The Casimir force is equivalent to a negative pressure arising from the interaction of vacuum fluctuations with mirrors. Whereas the vacuum energy density is infinite in the absence of cutoff and badly defined (i.e. cutoff-dependent) otherwise, the Casimir pressure is well defined and cutoff-independent. It is found to have a ‘weak’ non vanishing value, i.e. a value much smaller than any estimate of the ‘large’ vacuum energy density. Furthermore, this value agrees with the results of experimental measurements. We will finally discuss briefly other mechanical effects of vacuum fluctuations which appear for moving mirrors. These effects also correspond to perfectly well defined theoretical predictions which are in principle observable, although their very small magnitude has up to now prevented their experimental observation.

We begin with a few historical remarks related to the early history of vacuum fluctuations. The classical idealization of space as being absolutely empty was already affected by the advent of statistical mechanics, when it was realized that space is in fact filled with black body radiation. It is precisely for explaining the properties of this thermal radiation that Planck introduced

his first quantum law in 1900 [2]. In modern terms, this law gives the mean energy per electromagnetic mode as the product of the energy of a photon $\hbar\omega \equiv h\nu$ by a mean number of photons $\bar{n}$ per mode

$$\overline{E}_{\text{bbr}} = \bar{n}\hbar\omega \quad \bar{n} = \frac{1}{\exp\left(\frac{\hbar\omega}{k_{\text{B}}T}\right) - 1} \quad (1)$$

Here ‘bbr’ labels the effect of black body radiation. Planck was certainly aware of the unsatisfactory character of his first derivation. Like Einstein and other physicists, he attempted for years to give a more satisfactory proof of this law by studying in more detail the interaction between matter and radiation. These attempts and the related discussions which led finally to the discovery by Einstein of the quantum absorption-emission laws and of the Bose statistics of photons [3] are described for example in [4].

In a paper written in 1911, Planck [5] wrote a different expression where the mean energy per mode $\overline{E}$ contains a term $\frac{\hbar\omega}{2}$ which describes a zero-point energy superimposed to the black-body radiation energy

$$\overline{E} = \overline{E}_{\text{bbr}} + \frac{\hbar\omega}{2} \quad (2)$$

In contrast with the thermal fluctuations which disappear at the limit of zero temperature and can thus be ‘pumped out’ of a cavity by lowering the temperature, the zero-point fluctuations are still present at zero temperature. The arguments used by Planck for deriving his second law can no longer be considered as consistent today. Einstein was working along the same lines at the same time and he noticed in a paper [6] written with Stern in 1913 that the first Planck law does not reproduce exactly the classical limit at high temperature whereas the second law passes successfully this consistency check

$$T \rightarrow \infty \quad \overline{E}_{\text{bbr}} \simeq k_{\text{B}}T - \frac{\hbar\omega}{2} + \frac{\hbar^2\omega^2}{12k_{\text{B}}T} + \dots \quad \overline{E} = k_{\text{B}}T + O\left(\frac{1}{T}\right) \quad (3)$$

This may be considered as the first known argument still acceptable today: it fixes the numerical factor $\frac{1}{2}$ in front of $\hbar\omega$, a factor which was varying between 0 and 1 in the papers published at this time. Amazingly, this argument fixes the magnitude of zero-point fluctuations, essentially visible at low temperatures, by demanding their disappearance in the high temperature limit to be as perfect as possible !

It is worth emphasizing that physicists were numerous to take zero-point fluctuations seriously, long before the latter were rigorously deduced from the fully developed quantum theory. As Planck, most of them restricted their discussion of zero-point fluctuations to the case of atomic motion. Nernst is credited for having been the first to emphasize that the zero-point fluctuations should also exist for field modes [7]. In this sense, he may be considered as the father of ‘vacuum fluctuations’, that is precisely the zero-point fluctuations of the electromagnetic field. He remarked that the very existence of

these fluctuations dismisses the classical idea of an empty space which may be attained, at least in principle, by removing all matter from an enclosure and lowering the temperature down to zero. He also noticed that this existence constitutes a challenge for gravitation theory. When the vacuum energy density is calculated by adding the energies $\frac{\hbar\omega}{2}$ over all field modes, an infinite value is obtained. When a high frequency cutoff is introduced, the sum is finite but still much larger than the mean energy observed in the world around us through gravitational phenomena.

This major problem, which has been known since 1916, can be named the ‘vacuum catastrophe’ [8], in analogy with the ‘ultraviolet catastrophe’ solved by Planck in 1900. The analogy is more than formal as shown by the expression of the mean energy density calculated by summing (2) over all field modes up to a high frequency cutoff $\omega_{\max}$

$$\bar{\rho} = \bar{\rho}_{\text{bbr}} + \bar{\rho}_{\text{vac}} \quad \bar{\rho}_{\text{bbr}} = \frac{\pi^2 (k_{\text{B}}T)^4}{15 (\hbar c)^3} \quad \bar{\rho}_{\text{vac}} = \frac{(\hbar\omega_{\max})^4}{8\pi^2 (\hbar c)^3} \quad (4)$$

$\bar{\rho}_{\text{bbr}}$ represents the energy density of black body radiation and it is proportional to the fourth power T^4 of temperature, in consistency with the Stefan-Boltzmann law. The fact that it has a finite value independent of the cutoff is a great success of Planck theory of black body radiation. But this success is ruined by the appearance of the second term ! The vacuum energy density $\bar{\rho}_{\text{vac}}$ is proportional to the fourth power $\omega_{\max}^4$ of the cutoff, it diverges when $\omega_{\max}$ goes to infinity and it is in any case enormously larger than the observed energy density of empty space, for any value of the cutoff compatible with quantum field theory at the energies where the latter is well tested. This is directly connected to the ‘cosmological constant problem’ [9] which has remained unsolved up to now despite considerable efforts for proposing solutions (see the discussions in the present volume [1]).

The existence of vacuum fluctuations was confirmed by the quantum theory of electromagnetic field [10]. We do not need the complete theory in the present paper and we will present instead a simple representation of vacuum fluctuations used in the domain of quantum optics [11]. To this aim, we represent the field $\mathcal{E}$ in any of the involved modes, with a frequency ω , as a sum $\mathcal{E}_1 \cos \omega t + \mathcal{E}_2 \sin \omega t$ of two components proportional to $\cos \omega t$ and $\sin \omega t$ respectively. $\mathcal{E}_1$ and $\mathcal{E}_2$ are called the quadrature components of the field mode and they are quite analogous to the position and momentum of an harmonically bound particle. In particular, the two quadrature components are conjugated observables obeying an Heisenberg inequality $\Delta \mathcal{E}_1 \Delta \mathcal{E}_2 \geq \mathcal{E}_0^2$. This is the basic reason for the necessity of quantum fluctuations of electromagnetic fields, $\mathcal{E}_0$ being a constant measuring the amplitude of these quantum fluctuations. By definition, vacuum is simply the state corresponding to the minimum energy. Since the field energy is proportional to $\mathcal{E}_1^2 + \mathcal{E}_2^2$, this leads to null mean fields $\langle \mathcal{E}_1 \rangle = \langle \mathcal{E}_2 \rangle = 0$ and to equal and minimal variances for the two quadratures $\Delta \mathcal{E}_1^2 = \Delta \mathcal{E}_2^2 = \mathcal{E}_0^2$. This corresponds to the vacuum energy $\frac{\hbar\omega}{2}$ of the second Planck law (2).

It is worth emphasizing that vacuum fluctuations are real electromagnetic fields propagating in space with the speed of light, as any free field. Since the vacuum state corresponds to the minimal energy of field fluctuations, it is impossible to use this energy to build up perpetual motions violating the laws of thermodynamics. But electromagnetic vacuum fluctuations have well known observable consequences in atomic physics [12] and, more generally, in quantum field theory [13]. An atom interacting only with vacuum fields suffers spontaneous emission processes induced by these fields. When fallen in its ground state, the atom can no longer emit photons but its coupling to vacuum still results in measurable effects like the Lamb shift of absorption frequencies. Two atoms located at different locations in vacuum experience an attractive Van der Waals force which plays an important role in physico-chemical processes. Casimir was studying this effect when he discovered in 1948 that a force arises between two mirrors placed in vacuum [14]. This effect is discussed below.

These fluctuations have also been thoroughly studied through their effect on the properties of photon noise. Photon noise indeed reflects the quantum field fluctuations entering an optical system and they can be studied, controlled and, even in some cases, manipulated by using specifically designed devices [11]. This can be used for improving the noise control in high sensitivity measurement apparatuses developed for example for detecting gravitational waves or testing the equivalence principle in space experiments [15]. In this respect, the status of vacuum fluctuations in modern quantum theory is as firmly established as that of most quantum phenomena.

However, the problem of gravitation of the energy of vacuum fluctuations has persisted since Nernst. This point was crudely stated by Pauli in his textbook on Wave Mechanics [16] :

‘At this point it should be noted that it is more consistent here, in contrast to the material oscillator, not to introduce a zero-point energy of $\frac{1}{2}h\nu$ per degree of freedom. For, on the one hand, the latter would give rise to an infinitely large energy per unit volume due to the infinite number of degrees of freedom, on the other hand, it would be principally unobservable since nor can it be emitted, absorbed or scattered and hence, cannot be contained within walls and, as is evident from experience, neither does it produce any gravitational field’

A part of these statements is simply unescapable : the mean value of vacuum energy does not contribute to gravitation as an ordinary energy. This is just a matter of evidence since the universe would look very differently otherwise. However, it is certainly not possible to deduce, as Pauli did, that vacuum fluctuations have no observable effects. Certainly, vacuum fluctuations can ‘be emitted, absorbed, scattered...’ as shown by their numerous microscopic effects. When ‘contained within walls’, they lead to the observable, and in fact

observed, Casimir effect discussed below. And even if the reference level setting the zero of energy for gravitation theory turns out to be finely tuned in the vicinity of the mean value of vacuum energy density, energy differences and energy fluctuations still have to contribute to gravitation, a point which will be discussed in the end of this paper.

We now come back to the discussion of the Casimir force. Casimir calculated this force in a geometrical configuration where two plane mirrors are placed a distance L apart from each other, parallel to each other, the area A of the mirrors being much larger than the squared distance ($A \gg L^2$). Casimir considered the ideal case of perfectly reflecting mirrors and obtained the following expressions for the force F_{Cas} and energy E_{Cas}

$$F_{\text{Cas}} = \frac{\hbar c \pi^2 A}{240 L^4} \quad E_{\text{Cas}} = \frac{\hbar c \pi^2 A}{720 L^3} \quad (5)$$

The signs correspond to a convention opposite to the standard convention of thermodynamics (but common in papers on the Casimir force) : the force is attractive and corresponds to a negative pressure; meanwhile, the energy is a binding energy corresponding to a mean energy density slightly smaller inside the cavity than in the outside vacuum. Note that the energy density and pressure obey the equation of state of pure radiation.

The accuracy of the first experiments was limited but it has been greatly improved in recent measurements (see reviews in [17, 18]). Several experiments reached an experimental precision at the % level by using an atomic force microscope (AFM) [19] or micro-electromechanical systems (MEMS) [20]. Furthermore, the measurements agree with theory also at the % level provided that deviations from the ideal situation considered by Casimir are properly accounted for.

Let us first discuss the effect of imperfect reflection of the metallic mirrors used in the experiments. Note that the ideal Casimir formulas (5) only depend on the geometrical quantities A and L and on two fundamental constants, the speed of light c and Planck constant $\hbar$. This is a remarkably universal feature in particular because these formulas are independent of the atomic constants, for instance the electron charge e . This means that the Casimir force corresponds to a saturated response of the mirrors which reflect 100 % of the incoming light in the ideal case, whatever their atomic constitution may be. But experiments are performed with metallic mirrors which do not reflect perfectly all field frequencies and this has to be taken into account in theoretical estimations [21]. It follows that the force between real mirrors depends on the properties of the latter.

Imperfectly reflecting mirrors are described by scattering amplitudes which depend on the frequency, wavevector and polarization while obeying general properties of stability, high-frequency transparency and causality. The two mirrors form a Fabry-Perot cavity with the consequences well-known in classical or quantum optics : the energy density of the intracavity field is increased for the resonant frequency components whereas it is decreased for the non

resonant ones. The Casimir force is but the result of the balance between the radiation pressure of the resonant and non resonant modes which push the mirrors respectively towards the outer and inner sides of the cavity [22]. This balance includes not only the contributions of ordinary waves propagating freely outside the cavity but also that of evanescent waves. Using analyticity properties of the scattering amplitudes, the Casimir force is finally written as an integral over imaginary frequencies $\omega = i\xi$ (with ξ real)

$$F = \frac{\hbar A}{\pi} \sum_p \int \frac{d^2 \mathbf{k}}{4\pi^2} \int_0^\infty d\xi \frac{\kappa r_1 r_2}{\exp(2\kappa L) - r_1 r_2} \quad \kappa = \sqrt{\mathbf{k}^2 + \frac{\xi^2}{c^2}} \quad (6)$$

r_1 and r_2 are the reflection amplitudes of the two mirrors as they are seen from the intracavity fields and they are evaluated at imaginary frequencies, for a transverse wavevector $\mathbf{k}$ and a polarization p ; κ is the analytical prolongation of the longitudinal wavevector which determines the dephasing corresponding to one round trip.

This expression holds for dissipative mirrors as well as non dissipative ones [23]. Thanks to high-frequency transparency, it is regular for any physical amplitudes r_1 and r_2 , in spite of the infiniteness of vacuum energy. It goes to the Casimir formula (5) at the limit where mirrors may be considered as perfect ($r_1 r_2 \rightarrow 1$) over the frequency range of interest. Since metals are perfect reflectors at frequencies lower than their plasma frequency, the real force (6) deviates from the ideal expression (5) at distances L shorter than a few plasma wavelenghts, typically $0.3\mu\text{m}$ for gold or copper (for a more detailed discussion, see [21]).

A second important correction is due to the geometry. The ideal formula (5) corresponds to the geometry of two parallel plane plates whereas recent experiments have been performed with a sphere and a plane. The force in the latter geometry is usually estimated from the proximity theorem which basically amounts to integrate the force contributions of the various inter-plate distances as if they were independent. The force evaluated in this manner is thus given by the Casimir energy evaluated in the plane-plane geometry for the distance L of closest approach. Although the accuracy of this approximation remains to be mastered, it is thought to give a reliable approximation in the recent experiments [17]. The two already discussed corrections, respectively associated with imperfect reflection and plane-sphere geometry, have a significant impact on the value of the Casimir force and, thus, may be considered to be tested in the comparison between experimental measurements and theoretical expectations.

There are still further corrections taken into account in theory-experiment comparisons. The first one is the radiation pressure of thermal fluctuations which are superimposed to vacuum fluctuations as soon as the temperature differs from zero. Basically, this correction amounts to replace in (6) the vacuum energy by the total energy (2) of vacuum and black body fluctuations. The number of thermal photons is appreciable at low frequencies $\hbar\omega < k_B T$ so that

the thermal correction from the ideal formula is significant at large distances, typically above $3\mu\text{m}$ at room temperature (for a more detailed discussion, see [24, 25]). As a consequence, it is smaller than 1% for the most precise measurements which correspond to distances below $0.5\mu\text{m}$. The same conclusion is reached for the surface roughness correction, here because it would play a significant role at distances shorter than those explored in the experiments [17]. Since these two last corrections are small in the most precise recent measurements, the corresponding effects cannot be considered to have been tested experimentally.

We may conclude the discussion of the Casimir force by saying that the recent experimental and theoretical work have made possible an accurate comparison, say near the 1% level, between measurements and expectations. This is important for the reason discussed in the introduction. The Casimir force is the most accessible experimental consequence of vacuum fluctuations in the macroscopic world and it is crucial to test it with the greatest care and accuracy. Note also that mastering the Casimir force is a key point in a lot of very accurate force measurements at distances between nanometer and millimeter and which are motivated by searches for new short range weak forces predicted in theoretical unification models (see [17, 15] for reviews).

In the sequel of this paper, we will discuss dynamical generalizations of the Casimir effect. To be precise, the Casimir force is a mechanical consequence of vacuum radiation pressure observed in the presence of two static mirrors. There also exist such consequences for mirrors moving in vacuum and they are directly connected to the problem of relativity of motion. Even a single mirror isolated in vacuum experiences the fluctuations of vacuum radiation pressure [26, 27, 28, 29, 30]. When the mirror is motionless, the resulting force has a null mean value due to the balance between the contributions of opposite sides. When the mirror is moving, the balance is broken for the mean force which means that vacuum exerts a radiation reaction against motion. This reaction corresponds to a damping of the mechanical energy which is associated with an emission of radiation by the moving mirror into vacuum. The dissipative force is described by a susceptibility allowing one to express the force $F(t)$ in a linear approximation versus the time-dependent position $q(t)$. This expression is more conveniently written in the Fourier domain with Ω the frequency of mechanical motion

$$F[\Omega] = \chi[\Omega]q[\Omega] \quad (7)$$

The motional susceptibility $\chi[\Omega]$ is directly related to the force fluctuations evaluated for a mirror at rest through quantum fluctuation-dissipation relations [31]. We emphasize that it describes dissipative effects, i.e. the radiation reaction force and associated radiation emission, for a mirror moving without further reference than the vacuum fluctuations [32].

For comparison, let us consider a mirror moving through a thermal equilibrium field. It is well-known that a friction force proportional to the velocity q' arises in this case. In the frequency domain, the susceptibility is thus pro-

portional to the frequency : for a perfectly reflecting mirror in the limits of large plane area and large temperature $\left(A \gg \frac{c^2}{\Omega^2}, k_B T \gg \hbar \Omega\right)$, it is read as

$$\chi_{\text{bbr}}[\Omega] = \frac{i\pi^2 \hbar A}{15} \left(\frac{k_B T}{\hbar c}\right)^4 \Omega \quad F_{\text{bbr}}(t) = -\frac{\pi^2 \hbar A}{15} \left(\frac{k_B T}{\hbar c}\right)^4 q'(t) \quad (8)$$

The damping coefficient is proportional to the fourth power of temperature, again in full conformity with the Stefan-Boltzmann law, and it vanishes when T goes to zero. This does not lead to the absence of any dissipative effect of vacuum on a moving scatterer. For a perfectly reflecting mirror in the limits of large plane area and low temperature $\left(A \gg \frac{c^2}{\Omega^2}, k_B T \ll \hbar \Omega\right)$, we obtain

$$\chi_{\text{vac}}[\Omega] = \frac{i\hbar A}{60\pi^2 c^4} \Omega^5 \quad F_{\text{vac}}(t) = -\frac{\hbar A}{60\pi^2 c^4} q''''(t) \quad (9)$$

The susceptibility is now proportional to the fifth power of frequency which means that the force is proportional to the fifth order time derivative of the position. In particular, the radiation reaction force vanishes in the case of uniform velocity, so that the reaction of vacuum cannot distinguish between inertial motion and rest, in full consistency with the principle of special relativity of motion. The quantum formalism gives an interesting interpretation of this property : vacuum fluctuations are preserved under Lorentz transformations and they appear exactly the same to an inertial observer as to an observer at rest. At the same time, the existence of dissipative effects associated with arbitrary motion in vacuum challenges the principle of relativity of motion in its more general acceptance. The space in which motion takes place can no longer be considered as absolutely empty since vacuum fluctuations are always present, giving rise to real dissipative effects. In this sense, vacuum fluctuations allow us to define privileged reference frames for the definition of mechanical motions.

Note that the form of the last result can be guessed from the previous one through a mere dimensional analysis : the effect of temperature T appears in (8) measured as the fourth power $\left(\frac{k_B T}{\hbar}\right)^4$ of a frequency which is replaced by Ω^4 in (9). A similar dimensional argument appeared in the discussion of the expression (4) of vacuum energy density with $\left(\frac{k_B T}{\hbar}\right)^4$ replaced by ω_{max}^4 . There is however an important difference : the vacuum term which was ill-defined in (4) has now a regular cutoff-independent expression while being associated with well-defined physical effects. This is a further example, after the static Casimir effect, where we obtain a ‘weak’ (with respect to the ‘large’ vacuum energy density) but non vanishing value for an effect induced by vacuum fluctuations.

Clearly, it would be extremely interesting to obtain experimental evidence for the dissipative effects associated with motion in vacuum. These effects are exceedingly small for any motion which could be achieved in practice for

a single mirror, but an experimental observation is conceivable with a cavity oscillating in vacuum. In this case, the emission of motional radiation is resonantly enhanced [33] and specific signatures are available for distinguishing the motional radiation from spurious effects [34]. Hence, an experimental demonstration appears to be achievable with very high finesse cavities [35].

The radiation reaction force associated with the motion of a cavity in vacuum contains an inertial contribution in the specific case of uniformly accelerated motion. This effect is a quantum version, at the level of vacuum fluctuations, of Einstein argument for the inertia of a box containing a photon bouncing back and forth. Here, Einstein law of inertia of energy has to be applied to the case of a stressed body, where it is read [36]

$$F_{\text{vac}} = -\mu a \quad \mu = \frac{E_{\text{Cas}} - F_{\text{Cas}} L}{c^2} \quad (10)$$

The explicit calculation of the vacuum radiation reaction force gives an expression which perfectly fits this law [37, 38]. This means that the Casimir energy, which is a variation of the vacuum energy, contributes to the inertia of the Fabry-Perot cavity as expected from the general principles of relativity. Again this entails that, even if the mean value of vacuum energy does not contribute to gravity, energy differences such as the Casimir energy are expected to contribute to gravitational or inertial phenomena [39, 40].

Acknowledgements. We thank G. Barton, F. Capasso, E. Fischbach, M.-T. Jaekel, S. Lamoreaux, J. Long, P.A. Maia Neto, U. Mohideen and R. Onofrio for stimulating discussions.

References

- [1] Proceedings of the IAP'2002 Colloquium 'On the nature of dark energy'.
- [2] Planck M., Verh. Deutsch. Phys. Ges., 2 (1900) 237.
- [3] Wolf E., Opt. News, Winter issue (1979) 24.
- [4] Milonni P.W. and Shih M.-L., Am J. Phys., 59 (1991) 684.
- [5] Planck M., Verh. Deutsch. Phys. Ges., 13 (1911) 138.
- [6] Einstein A. and Stern O., Ann. Physik, 40 (1913) 551.
- [7] Nernst W., Verh. Deutsch. Phys. Ges., 18 (1916) 83.
- [8] Adler R.J., Casey B. and Jacob O.C., Am. J. Phys., 63 (1995) 620.
- [9] Weinberg S., Rev. Mod. Phys., 61 (1989) 1.
- [10] Dirac P.A.M., The Principles of Quantum Mechanics (Oxford University Press, 1958).
- [11] Reynaud S., Heidmann A., Giacobino E. and Fabre C., in Wolf E. ed., Progress in Optics XXX (North Holland, 1992) p.1.
- [12] Cohen-Tannoudji C., Dupont-Roc J. and Grynberg G., Processus d'interaction entre photons et atomes (InterEditions, 1988); Atom-Photon Interactions (Wiley, 1992).
- [13] Itzykson C. and Zuber J.-B., Quantum Field Theory (McGraw Hill, 1985).
- [14] Casimir H. B. G., Proc. K. Ned. Akad. Wet., 51 (1948) 793.
- [15] Reynaud S., Lambrecht A., Genet C. and Jaekel M.-T., C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, IV-2 (2001) 1287.

- [16] Pauli W., Die Allgemeinen Prinzipien der Wellenmechanik, in Geiger H. and Scheel K. (Eds), Handbuch der Physik 24 (1933) p.1; translation reproduced from Enz C.P., in Enz C.P. and Mehra J. eds, Physical Reality and Mathematical Description (Reidel, 1974) p.124.
- [17] Bordag M., Mohideen U., and Mostepanenko V.M., Phys. Rep. 353 (2001) 1.
- [18] Lambrecht A. and Reynaud S., to appear in Seminaire Poincare (2002).
- [19] Harris B. W., Chen F. and Mohideen U., Phys. Rev., A62 (2000) 052109.
- [20] Chan H.B., Aksyuk V.A., Kleiman R.N., Bishop D.J. and Capasso F., Science, 291 (2001) 1941.
- [21] Lambrecht A. and Reynaud S., Eur. Phys. J., D8 (2000) 309.
- [22] Jaekel M.-T. and Reynaud S., J. Physique, I-1 (1991) 1395, arXiv:quant-ph/0101067.
- [23] Genet C., Lambrecht A. and Reynaud S., preprint (2002).
- [24] Genet C., Lambrecht A. and Reynaud S., Phys. Rev., A62 (2000) 0121110.
- [25] Klimchitskaya G.L., Int. J. Mod. Phys., A17 (2002) 751.
- [26] Fulling S. A. and Davies P. C. W., Proc. R. Soc., A348 (1976) 393.
- [27] Ford L.H. and Vilenkin A., Phys. Rev., D25 (1982) 2569.
- [28] Jaekel M. T. and Reynaud S., Quantum Opt., 4 (1992) 39.
- [29] Barton G., in Berman P. (Ed), Cavity Quantum Electrodynamics (Academic Press, 1994).
- [30] Maia Neto P.A. and Machado L.A.S, Phys. Rev., A54 (1996) 3420.
- [31] Jaekel M.-T. and Reynaud S., Rep. Progr. Phys., 60 (1997) 863.
- [32] Jaekel M.-T., Lambrecht A. and Reynaud S., in Gunzig E. and Diner S. eds, Vacuum (Plenum, to appear), arXiv:quant-ph/9801071.
- [33] Lambrecht A., Jaekel M.-T. and Reynaud S., Phys. Rev. Lett., 77 (1996) 615.
- [34] Lambrecht A., Jaekel M.-T. and Reynaud S., Euro. Phys. J., D3 (1998) 95.
- [35] Jaekel M.-T., Lambrecht A. and Reynaud S., in Ruffini R. (Ed), Marcel Grossmann IX (World Scientific, to appear), arXiv:quant-ph/0105050.
- [36] Einstein A., Jahrb. Radioakt. Elektron., 4 (1907) 411 and 5 (1908) 98; english translation in Schwartz H.M., Am. J. Phys., 45 (1977) 512, 811, 899.
- [37] Jaekel M.-T. and Reynaud S., J. Physique, I-3 (1993) 1093, arXiv:quant-ph/0101082.
- [38] Machado L.A.S. and Maia Neto P. A., Phys. Rev., D65 (2002) 125005.
- [39] Moffat J.W. and Gillies G.T., preprint (2002) arXiv:gr-qc/0208005.
- [40] Caldwell R.R., preprint (2002) arXiv:astro-ph/0209312.